

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 8

REMARKS

In the Office Action of August 31, 2005 the Examiner has indicated, and the Applicants acknowledge, that claims 1-7 and 20-23 remain pending. Claims 8-19 have been cancelled via this paper without prejudice in response to an earlier issued restriction requirement. Claim 20 has been amended via this paper to more clearly define the invention. This amendment was not made to distinguish from prior art, therefore, all claims and claim limitations shall be construed as encompassing all equivalent structure and function. Claims 24 through 34 have been added via this paper as narrower versions of previously presented claims.

The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his courtesy during a personal interview with Applicants' representative Mr. James E. Shultz Jr. held on November 8, 2005. The content of this personal interview is memorialized herein.

Turning to paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the content of the abstract. The Applicants have accordingly amended the abstract. Therefore, this objection is now moot.

Turning to paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to the specification as not providing proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. The Applicants submit herewith an amendment to the specification including the subject matter as originally presented in the claims. Therefore, this objection is now moot.

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 9

Turning to paragraph 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner has objected to claim 20 because of identified informalities. The Applicants have accordingly amended claim 20, therefore, this objection is now moot.

Turning to paragraph 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,124,549, to Michaels et al. As discussed during the personal interview, the Applicants respectfully submit that the adjustment means discribed in column 5, lines 54-61, of Michaels et al. is directed to changing the position of the detector (more precisely the circuit board 24, as discussed in column 6, lines 47-54) relative the associated lens; the adjustment screw only provides for moving the height of the detector within the associated housing relative the lens. The Applicants respectfully submit that movement of an image sensor relative a lens will have a quite different result than movement of a single photosensitive detector relative a lens. Furthermore, the alignment pin 46 (which the Examiner refers to as an "attachment member") of Michaels et al. is not an equivalent structure to the attachment member recited in the claims of the present application; the alignment pins of Michaels et al. are for positioning only the lens as discussed in column 5, lines 9-14; the alignment pins of Michaels et al. have no effect what so ever on positioning of the detector. During the personal interview the Examiner pointed to the abstract of Michaels et al. as stating, "An adjustment mechanism provides very fine angular view adjustments....". The Applicants respectfully submit that where Michaels et al. uses either "angle" or "angular" the reference is to, "a need for a vehicle light sensor which precisely controls the entrance angle of the light and is not affected by light outside this

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 10

angle" as described in column 2, lines 14-16, and elsewhere. There is no teaching within Michaels et al. regarding manipulation of an associated optical axis, let alone, teach a structure that would accomplish such a manipulation. In that the lens(32) of Michaels et al. remains stationary irrespective of the position of the adjustment screw(58) there is no way to manipulate an optical axis.

Therefore, the Applicants respectfully submit that Michaels et al. does not teach or suggest an automatic vehicle exterior light control system, comprising: an attachment member and carrier/baffle configured to secure an imager board within approximately 5 degrees and approximately -5 degrees of a desired image sensor optical axis as recited in claim 1 of the present application. In that claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, the Applicants submit that claims 1, 3 and 4 are in condition for allowance over Michaels et al.

Additionally, the Applicants respectfully submit that Michaels et al. does not teach or suggest an automatic vehicle equipment control system, comprising: an attachment member and carrier configured to secure an imager board within approximately 5 degrees and approximately -5 degrees of a desired image sensor optical axis, said attachment member and said carrier cooperate to define an actual image sensor optical axis as recited in claim 20 of the present application. Therefore, the Applicants submit that claim 20 is in condition for allowance over Michaels et al.

Turning to paragraph 7, the Examiner has rejected claims 6, 7, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michaels et al. The Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claims 6 and 7

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 11

depend from claim 1, that claims 6 and 7 are in condition for allowance over Michaels et al. Additionally, the Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claims 21 and 22 depend from claim 20, that claims 21 and 22 are in condition for allowance over Michaels et al.

Turning to paragraph 8, the Examiner has rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michaels et al. in view of U.S. Patent 6,429,594, to Stam et al. The Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claim 2 depends from claim 1 that claim 2 is in condition for allowance over Michaels et al., Stam et al. and the combination thereof.

Turning to paragraph 9, the Examiner has rejected claims 5 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Michaels et al. in view of U.S. Patent 4,708,410, to Blank et al. The Applicants submit that at least for the reasons expressed above and in light of the fact that claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 23 depends from claim 20 that claims 5 and 23 are in condition for allowance over Michaels et al., Blank et al. and the combination thereof.

Applicants : Jeremy A. Fogg et al.
Appln. No. : 10/783,273
Page : 12

The Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that claims 1-7 and 20-34, as currently presented, are in condition for allowance. The Applicants submit that no new subject matter has been introduced via this paper. In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicants submit that the present invention, as defined in the pending claims, is allowable over the prior art of record. The Examiner's reconsideration and timely allowance of the claims is requested. A Notice of Allowance is, therefore, respectfully solicited. Please contact the undersigned should additional information be required.

Respectfully submitted,
JEREMY A. FOGG ET AL.
By: Gentex Corporation

November 14, 2005
Date

James E. Shultz Jr.
James E. Shultz Jr.
Registration No. 50,511
600 N. Centennial Street
Zeeland, Michigan 49464
616/772-1800